

Business of the House

Messrs:

MacLean	Rodrigue
Macquarrie	Rondeau
MacRae	Rowland
McCleave	Ryan
McGrath	Rynard
McIntosh	Schumacher
McKinley	Scott
McQuaid	Simpson
Marshall	Skoreyko
Mather	Souham
Matte	Stanfield
Mazankowski	Tétrault
Monteith	Thomas
Moore	(Moncton)
Nesbitt	Thompson
Nowlan	(Red Deer)
Orlikow	Valade
Paproski	Winch
Peddle	Wooliams
Peters	Yewchuk—80.
Ritchie	

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to seek clarification. Now that the motion has been passed, according to the motion four sitting days shall be allotted to the further consideration in committee of the whole. I note it is almost ten minutes to five o'clock. At five o'clock there will be private members' business, and after eight o'clock we will be seeking information from the government on questions and other matters. That may leave anywhere from an hour or an hour and a quarter for further consideration in committee if the whole. I therefore seek from the Chair clarification that today is not a day within the meaning of the four sitting days as stated in the motion.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I note there is a point of order here but from my point of view it would be quite acceptable, without asking the Chair to rule on the point of order, that the fourth day begin at the beginning of the next sitting.

Mr. MacInnis: When is the first day going to start?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I meant to say the first day.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That was understood. I wonder whether the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) is rising on the same point of order.

Mr. McCleave: It is a different point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member says it is a different point of order. I am not sure whether it is necessary to rule, but in view of the fact that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) indicated earlier today that his interpretation was that this meant four days beginning today, perhaps I should make a ruling. My interpretation would be that the four days would begin tomorrow. I think we could have taken up most of the day as we actually are going to do now: with the question period and routine proceedings we might well proceed

through a substantial part of the evening sitting. So the four days would really be four days beginning tomorrow.

I do not know whether this is a precedent for the many instances in the future when the House will be called upon to vote on a motion under Standing Order 75C, but I would think that should be the normal interpretation of the Standing Order.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, since we are being denied the right to examine many important amendments to this bill, including amendments the government House leader introduced today, and since I have some responsibility as do other members with regard to examining this legislation for the people of Canada, I ask if the government House leader would be disposed to give consideration to extending the hours of sitting during those four days.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I would be quite happy to extend the sittings in accordance with the discussions we might have among the parties, by motion or by bringing in a suggestion in the form of a house order tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in view of the understanding the House has just reached, to the effect that the four days will begin on Friday, I was correct in my original understanding that the committee of the whole stage would end on Wednesday. The correction I made under Standing Order 37(1) was apparently unnecessary. I was right the first time.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, in rising on a point of order I thought I would try to introduce an element of orderly consideration into the problems we face as a result of the vote. The point I wanted to make was simply that because we are faced with a rather large catalogue of tax changes, because we are faced with a rather smaller catalogue—but still pretty impressive—of the implementation of corrections and changes, and because we are now faced with four days of having to deal with these changes in committee of the whole, would it be possible to reach some kind of understanding this evening concerning a deadline in respect of notice about changes which are to be brought in?

• (4:50 p.m.)

The reason I ask is simply that at the very last moment 100 new changes might be thrown at us which we would never have the chance to consider and debate. If we could get some idea from the government as to when new changes as to co-operatives and credit unions would be brought in, at least we would know where we are going. That was my point of order.

Mr. MacEachen: I assure my hon. friend that we will produce the amendments relating to co-operatives and credit unions as soon as possible, and I will make inqui-